

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/550,807	06/15/2006	David Andrew Horsnell	16970US01	3988	
	7590 08/15/200 S HELD & MALLOY,		EXAMINER		
500 WEST MA	ADISON STREET	MARTIN, LAURA E			
SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL	60661		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2853		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		·		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/550,807	HORSNELL ET AL.	
		Examiner <sup>-</sup>	Art Unit	
		Laura E. Martin	2853	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	, .
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DONE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.11 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a re will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON , cause the application to become AB.	CATION.  Apply be timely filed  If HS from the mailing date of this communicat  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 So</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		is
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o			·
Applicati	ion Papers			
9)□ 10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 September 2005</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ drawing(s) be held in abeyan ion is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ a)(	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document:  2. Certified copies of the priority document:  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Aprity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachms -	(*/c)			
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application 	

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the Patent Cooperation Treaty is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. Unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

## **Priority**

Acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed on 9/23/05.

# Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

#### Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the plunger" should be "a plunger". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim (claim 3). See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim\*\*\* not been further treated on the merits.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 10/550,807

Art Unit: 2853

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor et al. (EP 0109242 A2).

# Taylor et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 1: a drop on demand ink printer (page 1, lines 5-10), characterized in that the printer is operated at a fluid pressure of between 1 and 3.5 bar (page 17, line 21-page 18, line 14) and that the image forming composition has a viscosity of less than 100 cp (page 17, lines 14-20).

As per claim 2: the viscosity of the image forming composition is in the range of 5 to 20 cp (page 17, lines 14-20).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. (EP 0109242 A2) in view of Horsnell et al. (WO 03/069201 A1).

### Taylor et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 3: the method of claims 1 and 2; and an array of nozzles (page 2,

lines 18-22), a solenoid valve (page 13, lines 8-17) to, in use, control the flow of the image forming composition through the nozzle orifices, the nozzle openings having a diameter in the range of 20 to 200 micrometers (page 11, lines 9-25).

As per claim 4: the nozzle orifices have a diameter in the range of substantially 40 to 60 micrometers for thin mesh fabric types (page 11, lines 9-25 - nozzles in the range for any type of print media).

As per claim 5: the solenoid valve mechanisms for controlling the flow of fluid to the nozzle orifice comprises a plunger member journalled for axial reciprocation between a rest and an operative position (figure 7; page 13, line 18-page 14-line 18). Taylor et al. do not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 3: a plunger of the solenoid valve has a diameter of less than 2.5 mm.

As per claim 5: a plunger member journalled within an electric coil under the influence of a magnetic field generated by that coil when an electric current passes through the coil, the distal end of the plunger extending into a valve head chamber having an outlet nozzle bore, the reciprocation of the plunger being adapted to open or close a fluid flow path from the valve head chamber through that bore, characterised in that: a. the plunger is of a unitary construction and is made from an electromagnetically soft material having a saturation flux density greater than 1.4 Tesla, preferably about 1.6 to 1.8 Tesla, a coercivity of less than 0.25 ampere per metre, and a relative magnetic permeability in excess of 10,000; and b. the nozzle bore leading from the valve head

Art Unit: 2853

chamber to the nozzle orifice has a length to diameter ratio of less than 8:1, preferably from 1.5:1 to 5:1, notably from 2:1 to 4:1.

As per claim 6: the valve is held in the open position for a prolonged period of time to print continuous lines on the mesh fabric.

As per claim 7: the amplitude of the current flowing through the coil required to hold the plunger in the valve open position is surprisingly much less, typically 80 to 50% less, than the current required to move the plunger initially away from its rest position.

Horsnell et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 3: a plunger of the solenoid valve has a diameter of less than 2.5 mm (claim 6).

As per claim 5: a plunger member journalled within an electric coil under the influence of a magnetic field generated by that coil when an electric current passes through the coil, the distal end of the plunger extending into a valve head chamber having an outlet nozzle bore, the reciprocation of the plunger being adapted to open or close a fluid flow path from the valve head chamber through that bore, characterised in that: a. the plunger is of a unitary construction and is made from an electromagnetically soft material having a saturation flux density greater than 1.4 Tesla, preferably about 1.6 to 1.8 Tesla, a coercivity of less than 0.25 ampere per metre, and a relative magnetic permeability in excess of 10,000; and b. the nozzle bore leading from the valve head chamber to the nozzle orifice has a length to diameter ratio of less than 8:1, preferably from 1.5:1 to 5:1, notably from 2:1 to 4:1 (claim 1).

As per claim 6: the valve is held in the open position for a prolonged period of time to print continuous lines on the mesh fabric (page 12, line 23-page 13, line 12).

As per claim 7: the amplitude of the current flowing through the coil required to hold the plunger in the valve open position is surprisingly much less, typically 80 to 50% less, than the current required to move the plunger initially away from its rest position (page 12, line 23-page 13, line 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method taught by Taylor et al with the disclosure of Horsnell et al. in order to provide a higher quality printing method.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kataoka et al. (US 2001/0055053 A1) discloses printing on a fabric (mesh).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura E. Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/550,807

Art Unit: 2853

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laura E. Martin

MANISH S. SHAH PRIMARY EXAMINER